

Wilson Refuses to Compromise; No Hope for Treaty; He Says France Is Now Ruled by Militarists

Tax on Stock Dividends Is Held Illegal

Supreme Court, 5 to 4,
Declares Provisions of
Revenue Act of 1916
Are Unconstitutional

Millions Refund
For Investors

Majority Opinion Finds
Stockholder Gets Nothing
and Subject to Risk

WASHINGTON, March 8.—A
staggering blow at the taxation
power of the government was dealt
by the Supreme Court to-day, when
by a vote of 5 to 4 it declared un-
constitutional the provisions of the
revenue act of 1916 imposing an
income tax on stock dividends.

Not only does the opinion close
the door to future revenue from this
source, but it will require the Treas-
ury Department to refund millions
of dollars collected illegally since
1916.

The government is already faced to
face with a deficit of \$1,000,000,000.
The money it has collected through
levies on stock dividends has in
large part been expended, and ex-
perts of the Treasury and in Con-
gress were to-night desperately seek-
ing to estimate the additional
amounts which Congress must im-
mediately provide through new
sources of taxation or by further
borrowing to meet these require-
ments.

The opinion is of such a sweeping
character as to leave the way open to
those who have paid taxes on these
stock dividends to file their claims for
a refund, and the opinion, in the be-
lief of the experts, leaves no means
whereby the department can resist
such claims.

Seen Protection Against Tax
The prediction is made that, avail-
ing themselves of today's decision,
corporations in large numbers will
adopt a policy of issuing stock di-
vidends in place of cash as a means
of protecting their shareholders from
the Federal tax collector. Representative
Hall, of Tennessee, one of the rank-
ing Democratic members of the House
Ways and Means Committee and
author of the income tax, went so far
as to predict that these issues of
stock dividends will aggregate a bil-
lion dollars between now and the time
final returns for 1919 are filed
with the Internal Revenue collector.

Such also is the belief expressed by
Justice Brandeis, who delivered the
majority opinion of the court.
The stock dividends representing
profits are held exempt from taxation
under the Sixteenth Amendment. Jus-
tice Brandeis said, "the owners of the
most successful businesses in America
will be able to escape taxation on a
large part of what is actually their
income."

The case decided to-day was in-
tended as a test of the validity of the
tax and was brought by Mrs. Myrtle
H. Macomber in the New York Fed-
eral Court to recover taxes paid on
dividend shares of the Standard Oil
of California, which she had received
as a stock dividend. The lower courts
decided in her favor and appeal was
made by Mr. Fisk, then Collector
of Internal Revenue for New York.
To-day's decision upholds the verdict
of the lower court.

Stockholder Receives "Nothing"

The highest court has had this case
under consideration since last October.
After considering the whole issue of
stock dividends and their value, the
court found that "far from being a
realization of profits of the stock-
holder, it tends rather to postpone such
realization in that the fund repre-
sented by the new stock has been
transferred from surplus to capital and
no longer is available for actual dis-
tribution."

Continuing, the court said upon this
point:
"The essential and controlling fact
is that the stockholder has received
nothing out of the company's assets
for his separate use and benefit; on
the contrary, every dollar on his origi-
nal investment, together with what-
ever accretions and accumulations that
were resulted from the employment of
his money and that of the other stock-
holders in the business of the company,
still remains the property of the com-
pany and subject to business risks
which may result in wiping out the
truth of the matter, to substance
and not to form, the definition of
the holding that stock dividends are
as much income as cash dividends, in so
far as the taxing power of the govern-
ment is concerned."

Problems Facing Congress
Representative Hull summed up the
problems now to be faced by Congress
as follows:
Congress cannot now tax stock-
holders with respect to undivided
profits in a corporation.
Groups of individuals can now
form artificial entities and screen

Continued on page three
Liberty Bonds—\$50, \$100, \$500, \$1,000
bought and sold instantly.
John M. & Co., 51 Broadway—Adv.

Germany to Ask 45 Billion Marks Loan; Modification of Occupation

PARIS, March 8.—A dispatch to "Le Journal" from Berlin says
that the German government will hand to the Allies in May a memorandum
insisting on the necessity of granting to Germany a loan of
45,000,000,000 marks.

The memorandum will demand modification of the rules governing
the Allied occupation, the dispatch adds.

Archbishop Hayes Denounces Anderson as Bigotry Breeder

Sinister Figure in Politics, Says Prelate, Denying
Catholics Made Deal With Tammany; Anti-
Saloon Leader Defiant in Talk to Clergy

William H. Anderson, state superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League,
is called a breeder of bigotry, a fomenter of distrust and a breeder of mis-
chief in an official statement sent out last night by Archbishop Hayes as
a reply to Anderson's charges that Catholics in New York were working
with Tammany politicians to defeat constitutional prohibition.

The document containing the Archbishop's denunciation of the Anti-
Saloon League leader is brief and pointed. It denies emphatically any
alliance between the Catholic Church and any political organization and
declares that no honest man believes that the Catholic Church is an enemy
of law and order.

Anderson is referred to as a "sinister
figure in American politics," and the
Archbishop expresses his gratification
that the attitude of the Protestant
clergy is not in sympathy with the anti-
Catholic utterances of the Anti-Saloon
League's leader.

Anderson Denies Attack
Temporarily, at least, the pending in-
vestigation of the league by the Legis-
lature is overshadowed by the religious
strife aroused by the Anderson letter.
Mr. Anderson, addressing a gathering of
Methodist Episcopal ministers at 150
Fifth Avenue yesterday morning, de-
voted a large part of his time to a jus-
tification of his previous activities in
this connection. He denied that he or
the league had ever attacked the Cath-
olic Church or Catholics, as such, and
he said that "the time is coming, if it
is not already here, when the Catholic
Church in America will have to decide
whether it will wholeheartedly stand
for an honest test of the prohibition
policy, or whether it will stand with
those who are trying to bring the
amendment into disrepute through
violation of the law."

Mr. Anderson said also that the
Anti-Saloon League intends "wherever
it finds Catholics working, as such,
against prohibition enforcement to
bring to the fact to the attention of the
public."
The meeting adopted a resolution
which heartily indorses and supports
the action of the Anti-Saloon League of
New York not alone for the way it has
taken in the struggle which is now on
and the work it is now doing to beat
back the vicious counter-attack which
seeks to discredit the league and break
down national prohibition.

Religion Phase Ignored
Nothing was said about the religious
aspects of Mr. Anderson's address.
A further expression of opposition
to Mr. Anderson in his attack on Cath-
olics comes from the Men's Bible
Forum of the First Congregational
Church of Plainfield, N. J., which has
unanimously adopted a resolution de-
claring such attacks wicked and un-
American and the charges unfair, un-
true and destructive of the only thing
which will keep and enforce the
Eighteenth Amendment, namely, pub-
lic opinion and good will toward this
experiment in social welfare.

The statement issued last night by
Archbishop Hayes reads as follows:
"While yielding to many pressing de-
mands for a statement on the slander-
ous attack by the leader of the Anti-
Saloon League on the Catholic Church,
I feel that, in taking notice of it, I
should apologize, first of all, for not
leaving the matter to the decent sen-
timents of the public, which since
has passed judgment on this zealot,
his tongue and his methods."
"I am gratified, indeed, to observe
that the attitude of the Protestant clergy,
who, if I may judge from the press, are
not in sympathy with the anti-Catholic
utterances of Mr. Anderson."
"My purpose in speaking is not to re-

Continued on page six

Hylan Invites All Aggrieved Tenants to Join Rent Strike

Any tenant threatened with an in-
crease in rent who wants to join a
war on profiteering landlords may re-
ceive the support of the city by apply-
ing to Room 1220, Municipal Building,
which is the headquarters of the
Mayor's Committee on Rent Profit-
ing. Should the threatened increase
be found unreasonable, the tenant will
be advised to go on a rent strike. The
landlord then will be subpoenaed and
told that his premises will be invaded
by a horde of tenement house inspec-
tors if he persists in demanding the in-
crease.

The fact that New York officially is
conducting a rent strike developed yester-
day after James F. Gannon Jr., di-
rector of revenue and finance of Jer-
sey City, had conferred with Mayor
Hylan at City Hall on the rent situa-
tion in New York. Mr. Gannon de-
tailed to the Mayor how the Jersey
City authorities had helped tenants in
a well-advised, city-wide strike and
how more than 8,000 profiteering land-
lords had been induced to yield, in
most instances without the formality
of going into court. Mr. Gannon also
suggested to the Mayor a plan to build
out of the public funds enough apart-
ment houses in vacant land in the
Bronx and on Long Island to take care
of the city's present surplus population.

Mayor "Much Pleased"
After the conference, the Mayor said
he was "much pleased with Mr. Gan-
non's excellent scheme." He promised

Enright Asks Open Court Vice Inquiry

Mayor Announces Favor
With Proposal After
Getting Commissioner's
Letter Assailing Smith

Prosecutor Insists
On Strict Secrecy

Two Woman Witnesses in
Gunson Case Suddenly
Acquire Funds for Bail

Moves of the Hylan administration
to force the police-vice investigation
into open court, thus compelling im-
mediate disclosure of all the District
Attorney's sources of information,
were met yesterday with determined
opposition on the part of the prose-
cutor.

Both Mayor Hylan and Police Com-
missioner Enright wrote letters, in
which they asked for the opening of
John Doe proceedings before City Magistrate McAdoo, which would dis-
pense with the secrecy of the grand
jury room and compel the appearance
of witnesses where they might be
cross-examined by lawyers for the ac-
cused policemen.

Coincident with this move of the
police came evidence that witnesses
to be used in the pending case against
John J. Gunson, plain clothes man on
Inspector Dominick Henry's staff, have
been approached by outside influences.
Two women being held as material wit-
nesses under \$1,000 bonds suddenly
came into possession of sufficient funds
to make application for their release.
At the time of their arrest they said
they had nobody to whom they could
go for financial aid.

Neither of the women succeeded in
getting out of the jurisdiction of the
prosecuting attorney, however. Their
application for release on bonds is ex-
pected to be withdrawn, and the dis-
cussion from that official this morning
when they appear before Judge Malone
for final arguments.

The first move that was character-
ized as an attempt to force the hand
of Assistant District Attorney James E.
Smith, who is in charge of the present
investigation, took the form of a let-
ter from Commissioner Enright to
Mayor Hylan. Commissioner Enright
wrote:

"From time to time during the
last two years sensational state-
ments emanating from an Assistant
District Attorney have appeared in
the press, alleging the existence of a
corrupt alliance between members
of this department and the vicious
and criminal element in this city.
Most of these statements have been
attributed to this Assistant District
Attorney regarding whose method of
handling vice and gambling proceed-
ings there has been a great deal of
complaint upon the part of a number
of the police officers."

"You will remember that some time
ago the columns of the newspapers
were filled with stories emanating
from the same source regarding an
alleged 'blue book' in the possession
of the police."

Continued on page six

Present Values Of Roads Upheld

Supreme Court Decides
They Must Be Basis on
Which to Fix Profits

From The Tribune's Washington Bureau
WASHINGTON, March 8.—The Su-
preme Court ruled in a decision made
public to-day, that the Interstate Com-
merce Commission must accept the
present value of railroad rights of
ways and terminals, instead of the
cost of the land, in fixing the valuation
of the lines.

The decision is regarded as a far-
reaching victory for the railroads. As
the valuation eventually determined on
by the commission probably will be
used as the basis of calculating the 7
per cent return to owners of railroad
securities guaranteed by the Esch-
Cummins law, the decision of the court
means that the earnings of the roads
shall be calculated on their book value
and not on what they cost.

The effect of the decision may be to
increase rates, unless the earnings of
the roads this year are 5 1/2 per cent
of their valuation, which is \$20,000,000.
Opponents of valuation on the
present value assert the railroads will
earn far more money under the de-
cision than they would if valuation
were based on cost.

The decision was in a test case
brought by the Kansas City Southern,
supported by other lines, which con-
tended that the valuation of \$5,000,000
put on its property by the commission
represented its cost originally and was
not a fair estimate of the present
value of the holdings in question, which
were said to be worth \$10,000,000. The
commission had refused to accept the
latter figure, which was the valuation
put on the property by the railroad.

In its decision the Supreme Court
reversed Federal court decrees dis-
missing mandamus proceedings brought
to compel the commission to estimate
cost of the land finding the present cost
of condemning the land belonging to
the carrier.

GOOD MORNING:
Need Office Help? The country's future
Executives read The Tribune. Call the
Good Morning Unit—Brooklyn 3010—and
give her your advertisement for to-mor-
row's issue—Adv.

Text of President's Note on Treaty

WASHINGTON, March 8.—President Wilson's letter to Senator Hitchcock opposing reser-
vations to the peace treaty which would weaken the pact, which was made public to-day, follows:

My Dear Senator Hitchcock:

I understand that one or two
of your colleagues do me the
honor of desiring to know what
my views are with reference to
Article X of the league of nations
and the effect upon the league of
the adoption of certain proposed
reservations to that article. I
welcome the opportunity to throw
any light I can upon a subject
which has become so singularly
obscured by misapprehensions and
misinterpretations of every kind.

There is no escaping the moral
obligations which are expressed in
positive terms in this article of
the covenant. We won a moral
victory far greater even than the
military victory won on the field
of battle, because the opinion of
the whole world swung to our
support and the support of the
nations associated with us in the
great struggle. It did so because
of our common profession and
promise that we meant to estab-
lish "an organization of peace
which should make it certain that
the combined power of free na-
tions would check every invasion
of right and serve to make peace
and justice the more secure by
affording a definite tribunal of
opinion to which all must submit
and by which every international
readjustment that cannot be ami-
cably agreed upon by the peoples
directly concerned shall be sanc-
tioned."

Obligation Held Sacred

This promise and assurance
were written into the prelimi-
naries of the armistice and into
the preliminaries of the peace
itself and constitute one of the
most sacred obligations ever as-
sumed by any nation or body of
nations. It is unthinkable that
America should set the example
of ignoring such a solemn moral
engagement.

For myself, I feel that I could
not look the soldiers of our gal-
lant armies in the face again if
I did not do everything in my
power to remove every obstacle
that lies in the way of the adop-
tion of this particular article of
the covenant, because we made
these pledges to them as well as
to the rest of the world, and it
was to this cause they deemed
themselves devoted in a spirit of
crusaders. I should be forever
unfaithful to them if I did not do
my utmost to fulfill the high pur-
pose for which they fought.

Stipulations Unnecessary

I think, my dear Senator, we
can dismiss from our minds the
idea that it is necessary to stipu-
late in connection with Article X
the constitutional methods we
should use in fulfilling our obliga-
tions under it. We gain nothing
by such stipulations and secure
nothing which is not already se-
cured. It was understood as a
matter of course at the conference
in Paris that whatever obligations
any government assumed, or what-
ever duties it undertook under the
treaty, would, of course, have to
be fulfilled by its usual and estab-
lished constitutional methods of
action. Once or twice in meetings
of the conference, when the treaty
was under consideration, "reser-
vations" were made to that effect by
the representatives of individual
powers, and those "reservations"
were invariably received in the
way in which men who have
met for business and not for talk
always receive acts of scrupulous
supererogation, listened to with
indifferent silence, as such men
listen to what is a matter of course
and was not necessary to say.

There can be no objection to
again explaining what our consti-
tutional method is and that our
Congress alone can declare war
or determine the causes or occa-
sions for war, and that it alone

can authorize the use of the armed
forces of the United States on
land or on the sea. But to make
such a declaration would certainly
be a work of supererogation.

Reservations Held to Nullify

I am sorry to say that the
reservations that have come under
my notice are almost without ex-
ception not interpretations of the
articles to which it is proposed to
attach them, but in effect virtual
nullifications of those articles.

Any reservation which seeks
to deprive the league of nations of
the force of Article X cuts at the
very heart and life of the cove-
nant itself. Any league of na-
tions which does not guarantee as
a matter of incontestable right
the political independence and in-
tegrity of each of its members
might be hardly more than a fu-
tile scrap of paper, as ineffective
in operation as the agreement be-
tween Belgium and Germany
which the Germans violated in 1914.

Article X, as written into the
Treaty of Versailles, represents
the renunciation by Great Britain
and Japan, which before the war
had begun to find so many inter-
ests in common in the Pacific, by
France, by Italy—by all the great
fighting powers of the world of
the old pretensions of political
conquest and territorial aggran-
dizement. It is a new doctrine in
the world's affairs and must be
recognized or there is no secure
basis for the peace which the
whole world so longingly desires
and so desperately needs. If
Article X is not adopted and acted
upon the governments which re-
ject it will, I think, be guilty of
bad faith to their people whom
they induced to make the infinite
sacrifices of the war by the pledge
that they would be fighting to re-
deem the world from the old order
of force and aggression.

Bad Faith Suggested

They will be acting also in
bad faith to the opinion of the
world at large to which they ap-
pealed for support in a concerted
stand against the aggressions and
pretensions of Germany. If we
were to reject Article X or so to
weaken it as to take its full force
out of it it would mark us as de-
siring to return to the old world
of jealous rivalry and misunder-
standings from which our gallant
soldiers have rescued us, and
would leave us without any vision
or new conception of justice and
peace. We would have learned no
lesson from the war, but gained
only the regret that it had in-
volved us in its maelstrom of suf-
fering. If America has awakened,
as the rest of the world has, to the
vision of a new day in which the
mistakes of the past are to be cor-
rected, it will welcome the opportu-
nity to share the responsibilities
of Article X.

It must not be forgotten, Sena-
tor, that this article constitutes a
renunciation of wrong ambition on
the part of powerful nations with
whom we were associated in the
war. It is by no means certain
that without this article any such
renunciation will take place. Mil-
itaristic ambitions and imperial-
istic policies are by no means dead,
even in the counsels of the nations
whom we most trust, and with
whom we most desire to be asso-
ciated in the task of peace.

Throughout the sessions of the
Conference of Paris it was evi-
dent that a militaristic party, un-
der the most influential leadership,
was seeking to gain ascendancy in
the counsels of France. They were
defeated then, but are in control
now. The chief arguments ad-
vanced in Paris in support of the
Italian claims on the Adriatic
were strategic arguments—that
is to say, military arguments,
which had at their back the
thought of naval supremacy in
that sea. For my own part, I am
as intolerant of imperialistic de-
signs on the part of other nations
as I was of such designs on the
part of Germany.

Choice of Two Ideals

The choice is between two
ideals: On the one hand, the ideal

of democracy, which represents
the rights of free peoples every-
where to govern themselves, and,
on the other hand, the ideal of
imperialism, which seeks to do-
minate by force and unjust power,
an ideal which is by no means
dead and which is earnestly held
in many quarters still.

Every imperialistic influence
in Europe was hostile to the em-
bodiment of Article X in the
covenant of the league of nations,
and its defeat now would mark
the complete consummation of
their efforts to nullify the treaty.
I hold the doctrine of Article X
to be the essence of Americanism.
We cannot repudiate it or weaken
it without at the same time re-
pudiating our own principles.

The imperialist wants no league
of nations, but if, in response to
the universal cry of the masses
everywhere, there is to be one, he
is interested to secure one suited
to his own purposes, one that will
permit him to continue the historic
game of pawns and peoples—the
juggling of provinces, the old bal-
ances of power and the inevitable
wars attendant upon these things.
The reservation proposed would
perpetuate the old order.

Article X the Bulwark

Does any one really want to
see the old game played again?
Can any one really venture to take
part in reviving the old order?
The enemies of a league of nations
have by every true instinct cen-
tered their efforts against Article
X, for it is undoubtedly the
foundation of the whole structure.
It is the bulwark, and the only
bulwark, of the rising democracy
of the world against the forces
of imperialism and reaction.

"Either we should enter the
league fearlessly, accepting the
responsibility and not fearing the
role of leadership which we now
enjoy, contributing our efforts
toward establishing a just and
permanent peace, or we should re-
tire as gracefully as possible from
the great concert of powers by
which the world was saved. For my
own part, I am not willing to trust
to the counsel of diplomats the
working out of any salvation of
the world from the things which
it has suffered."

I believe that when the full sig-
nificance of this great question has
been generally apprehended, ob-
stacles will seem insignificant be-
fore the opportunity, a great and
glorious opportunity, to contribute
our overwhelming moral and mat-
terial force to the establishment
of an international régime in
which our own ideals of justice
and right may be made to prevail
and the nations of the world be
allowed a peaceful development
under conditions of order and
safety hitherto impossible.

All Reservations Condemned

I need not say, Senator, that
I have given a great deal of
thought to the whole matter of
reservations proposed in connec-
tion with the ratification of the
treaty, and particularly that por-
tion of the treaty which contains
the covenant of the league of na-
tions, and I have been struck by
the fact that practically every so-
called reservation was in effect a
rather sweeping nullification of
the terms of the treaty itself. I
hear of reservationists and mild
reservationists, but I cannot un-
derstand the difference between a
nullifier and a mild nullifier.

Our responsibility as a nation
in this turning point of history is
an overwhelming one, and if I had
the opportunity I would beg every-
one concerned to consider the mat-
ter in the light of what it is pos-
sible to accomplish for humanity
rather than in the light of special
national interests.

If I have been truly informed
concerning the desire of some of
your colleagues to know my views
in this matter, I would be very
glad if you should show this letter
to them.

Cordially and sincerely yours,
WOODROW WILSON,
Hon. Gilbert M. Hitchcock,
United States Senate.

Lodge Ideas Held to Mean Nullification

U. S. Fully Protected by
Verbal Stipulations
Made by Him in Paris,
He Assures Hitchcock
Article X Declared
Bulwark of League

Senators View Action as
Move to Make Covenant
Dominant 1920 Issue

By Carter Field

From The Tribune's Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON, March 8.—
President Wilson to-day refused the
request of Senator Hitchcock, Ad-
ministration leader, that he discuss
with Democratic Senators reser-
vations to Article X on which they
hoped a compromise was possible.
The President declared that while
he heard of reservationists and mild
reservationists, he could not "under-
stand the difference between a nulli-
fier and a mild nullifier."

In a letter to the leader of the Ad-
ministration forces in the treaty
fight, President Wilson reiterated
his opposition to any weakening of
Article X by reservations which
"would perpetuate the old order."
"Every imperialistic influence in
Europe was hostile to the embodi-
ment of Article X in the covenant,"
the letter said.

The President said that through-
out the Paris conference the French
militarists were seeking to gain the
ascendancy in the counsels of
France, and although defeated then
"they are in control now." "For my
own part," continued the President,
"I am as intolerant of imperialistic
designs on the part of other nations
as I was of such designs on the part
of Germany."

All Factions Lose Hope

Leaders of all factions in the Sen-
ate to-night were absolutely hope-
less of ratification. It was evident
that enough Democratic Senators
would stand by the President,
when added to the "irreconcilables"
to kill the treaty.

Seven Senators who recently had
voted to accept the Lodge proposals
flooded back to the Administration
side after reading the President's
letter. These were Senators Beck-
ham, Trammell, Nugent, Pittman,
Chamberlain, Kirby and Phelan.

The Administration strength in
resisting the four Lodge reser-
vations approved to-day ranged from
26 to 28, as compared with a
strength of from 17 to 22 last week.

Senate Shocked by Stand

The President's letter was a pro-
found shock and surprise to the Senate.
The "irreconcilables" were delighted,
assured at last that the constant ne-
gotiation which had been under way
looking to some compromise were made
futile. The strong Administration
Senators were dismayed. Senator
Hitchcock was hopeless. Senator King,
of Utah, confessed disappointment. The
so-called "mild reservationists," who
were on the verge of a revolt against
the Lodge program and who actually
had threatened yesterday, at a meet-
ing at the residence of Senator Lodge,
to desert the Republicans and go over
to the House, were driven back into
the Administration camp and
fenced in.

They were particularly incensed at
being called "mild nullifiers." Senator
Kellogg, who several times in the last
week has read the riot act to Senator
Lodge on the floor of the Senate, de-
clared yesterday that he was not very
different from the comments of the "irre-
concilables."

All "Foes" of Treaty

What chiefly amazed the Senate
was that the President's stance
that from his point of view a "mild
reservationist" like Senator Kellogg or
McNary was as real a foe of the treaty
as Senators Reed and Borah. It was this
that had often expressed the idea that
the group of Democrats had frightened
the Administration camp and led to their
voting against the Lodge reservations.
Another sore point with the so-called
"irreconcilables" was the Presi-
dent's reference, rather contemptuous
in their opinion, to those who sought
to make clear that Congress must act
before the army or navy should be
sent to enforce territorial integrity
of some foreign nation. These Sena-
tors did not like the President's state-
ment that such comments were listened
to at Paris with indifferent silence, as
such men listen to what is a matter
of course, and was not necessary to
say.

Republican Senators construed two
sentences of the letter as a statement
that unless Article X is adopted intact,
it would have been better if the United
States never had entered the war. Car-
rying the idea further, in conjunction
with the often expressed idea that Ger-
many would have won the war if the
United States had not entered it, they
construed it as a statement that it would
have been better for Germany to have
won the war than for the United States
now to refuse to approve the treaty.